

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/600,602	UEKI, JUN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David A. Lambertson	1636	
<b>All Participants:</b>		<b>Status of Application:</b> _____	
(1) <u>David A. Lambertson</u> .		(3) _____.	
(2) <u>Mark Nuell</u> .		(4) _____.	
<b>Date of Interview:</b> <u>12 October 2004</u>		<b>Time:</b> _____	
<b>Type of Interview:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)			
<b>Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, provide a brief description: _____			
<b>Part I.</b>			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed: <i>Claim 27.</i>			
Prior art documents discussed:			
<b>Part II.</b>			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: <i>See Continuation Sheet</i>			
<b>Part III.</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			
(Examiner/SPE Signature)		(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representative was contacted to clarify the proper grammatical progression of claim 27. It was agreed that the word "one" was absent in the second line of the claim, between the terms "least" and "polynucleotide." Additionally, the term "Novel" was removed from the first line of the Abstract because it is presumed that a patented invention is "novel." These amendments are reflected in the attached Examiner's Amendment.